

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 831

HE 022 493

AUTHOR Davis, George H.
TITLE Survey of Administrative Service Operations at the University of Arizona, Arizona State University, and Northern Arizona University.
INSTITUTION Arizona Board of Regents, Phoenix.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 15p.; In "The Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. Final Report and Working Papers." Volume Two. For Volumes One and Two, see HE 022 446-447. For individual working papers, see HE 022 448-480 and HE 022 482-501.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Competition; Educational Quality; Efficiency; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; Participant Satisfaction; Public Colleges; Questionnaires; State Surveys; *State Universities; *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS *Administrative Services; Arizona; Arizona State University; Arizona Task Force on Excellence Efficiency Compet; Noninstructional Staff; Northern Arizona University; Support Services; University of Arizona

ABSTRACT

The results of a survey on administrative services at Arizona's three universities are presented as one of the working papers in the final report of the Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. This survey of faculty, staff, and student perceptions of the quality of service provided by selected academic and nonacademic operations included responses to 875 faculty/staff questionnaires and 524 student questionnaires. Results show that faculty and students at all three universities agreed that only 1 of the 25 administrative service operations is of very high importance (the library), and no operations were considered to be of low importance. It is specifically recommended that this same survey be implemented at 3-year intervals in order to track changes in quality through time. Appended are copies of the questionnaires. (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE OPERATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, AND NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY

GEORGE H. DAVIS

SUMMARY

The EEC Task Force Staff conducted a survey of faculty, staff and student perceptions of the quality, importance and change in quality of the service provided by selected academic and nonacademic administrative operations at each of three Arizona universities. Distribution of the survey form was based on random sampling of populations of faculty, staff and students, grouped according to gender and class or rank. A total of 875 faculty/staff questionnaires (57% return) and 524 student questionnaires (35% return) were received. The chief purpose of the survey was to provide perspectives that would aid Coopers & Lybrand in their selection of administrative service operations that would receive closer review in their management audit. Furthermore, it was felt that the survey data would be of value to the management of each of the three universities.

The survey data are informative but are subject to misinterpretation if limitations are not clearly understood. There are no normative data that permit us to judge what in fact is a good score for a given unit, such as library services, as opposed to another unit, such as parking, and thus direct cross comparisons of quality ratings are suspect. Although most respondents evaluated the importance of a given unit in the way intended (i.e., how important is this service to you as you carry out your work as a faculty or staff member or student?), some appear to have rated the importance of the service or operation to the university. The differences between grand mean scores for all of the administrative service operations, viewed collectively for each of the three Arizona universities, are very small. Although the grand means are best estimates, the differences between scores are not meaningful. Thus it is inappropriate to use the grand means as a basis for ranking the three universities in terms of quality of services that they provide.

Finally, certain nonacademic administrative services are not used by all faculty, yielding very low numbers of

George H. Davis joined the faculty of the University of Arizona's Department of Geosciences in 1970, following PhD studies at the University of Michigan. His research and teaching have centered on the nature and origin of structures in mountain belts. Davis' undergraduate textbook, *Structural Geology of Rocks in Regions*, has extended his reach as a teacher to students outside of Arizona, in other parts of the country and the world. He also served as Head of the Department of Geosciences and serves as Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at UA.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AZ Board of Regents

2

1275

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

faculty evaluations received for such services. Similarly, certain academic administrative services are not used by all staff, yielding very low numbers of staff evaluations received for these services.

Certain major observations can be drawn. At all three universities, faculty, staff and students perceive the overall services to be midway between fair and good in quality, improving slightly. (The scale of choices for evaluation of quality ranged from very poor to very good). At all three universities, faculty, staff and students perceive the importance of the services, overall, to be high. (The scale of choices for evaluation of the importance of the services ranged from very low to very high).

Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, faculty at the University of Arizona ranked the quality of service of 13 operations as good and 12 as fair; and staff ranked the quality of service of 15 operations as good and 10 as fair. Of the 18 administrative service operations surveyed, students at the University of Arizona ranked the quality of service of 11 operations as good, 6 as fair and 1 (parking) as poor.

Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, faculty at Arizona State University ranked the quality of service of 13 administrative service operations as good, 10 as fair and 2 as poor (repair/remodeling and risk management;--caution--low numbers of ratings); and staff ranked the quality of service of 19 operations as good and 6 as fair. Of the 18 administrative service operations surveyed, students at Arizona State University ranked the quality of service of 11 operations as good, 6 as fair and 1 (parking) as poor.

Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, faculty at Northern Arizona University ranked the quality of service of 4 administrative service operations as good and 21 as fair; staff ranked the quality of service of 17 administrative service operations as good and 8 as fair. Of the 18 administrative service operations surveyed, students at Northern Arizona University ranked the quality of service of 11 operations as good, 6 as fair and 1 (parking) as poor.

Faculty and students at all three universities agreed that the single most important administrative service operation is the library, the only operation that received, overall, a very high importance rating. No operation was considered by faculty, staff or students to be of low or very low overall importance.

The chief value of the detailed data that will be passed on to the universities may lie in helping management to more confidently identify those administrative service operations which appear to be functioning well; to identify those that are functioning adequately; and to identify those that represent opportunities for improvement. The survey results may also permit management to evaluate whether the distribution of resources and priorities of emphasis are in line with the importance of these administrative service operations as viewed by faculty, staff and students.

It is specifically recommended that this survey be implemented at three year intervals. These initial survey results would then provide a benchmark to help evaluate the impact of administrative decisions related to the distribution of resources, organizational changes, leadership changes and the like. Data

from assessments gathered at three-year intervals could be used to map trends, such as changes in perception of quality through time.

INTRODUCTION

As part of the evaluation of management efficiency of the three Arizona Universities, the Task Force staff for the study on Efficiency, Excellence, and Competitiveness (EEC) conducted an assessment of faculty, staff, and student opinions regarding the quality, importance, and change in quality of services provided by university administrative service operations. Opinions were gathered by means of a questionnaire distributed to randomly selected faculty, staff, and students.

Results provide

- (1) comparative statistical information summarizing user perceptions of each of the major administrative service operations,
- (2) an integrated view of the level of overall satisfaction with the administrative service operations on each campus, and
- (3) a basis for measuring future changes in the quality of service provided by the administrative operations.

BACKGROUND

When it became understood that the firm of Coopers & Lybrand would be given only several months within which to carry out its field work in the evaluation of the management efficiency of the three Arizona universities, the EEC Task Force staff was asked to carry out certain preparatory steps that would enable the

firm to begin more quickly and to accomplish more than what might otherwise be possible. Among these was conducting a survey of faculty, staff, and student perceptions of the quality, importance, and change in quality of the main administrative service operations. It was felt that the results of such a survey could be used by Coopers & Lybrand to help them in their selection of the administrative service operations that would receive closer review.

Furthermore, it was felt that survey results would be of significant internal use to the three universities.

In the absence of readily available output-related measures that could be used to quickly but validly assess overall quality of service provided by each administrative service operation at each university, it was necessary to use a substitute methodology: to infer quality on the basis of user perceptions of the quality. Similarly, assessments of the importance and change in quality of the services provided by the administrative service operations had to be inferred from user perceptions.

Two survey instruments (questionnaires), one for faculty and staff, the other for students, were prepared with the help and advice of the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education ([Appendix A](#)). Each questionnaire listed the names of major administrative service operations relevant to the mission of faculty/staff and students, respectively. For each of the listed administrative service operations, the respondents, whether faculty, staff, or students, were asked the following:

- 1) How often do you use this service?
Choices: frequently, sometimes, never.

- 2) Rate the quality of the service.
Choices: very poor, poor, fair, good, very good.
- 3) How has the quality changed?
Choices: much worse, worse, same, better, much better.
- 4) Rate the importance of the service.
Choices: very low, low, average, high, very high.

The questionnaire was mailed to individuals identified through random sampling of "stratified" populations of faculty, staff, and students.

Full-time faculty on each campus were grouped according to gender and rank (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, other). Full-time staff were grouped according to gender and pay grade classification. Full-time students were grouped according to gender and class (first-semester freshmen, other freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, graduate students).

For faculty and staff, a random sample was drawn, distributed proportionately across the stratified subpopulations. For students, the names of 500 individuals were drawn randomly, again distributed proportionately across the stratified subpopulations. The number of questionnaires distributed, and the number and percentage of questionnaires returned, by institution and by category, were as follows:

A total of 875 faculty/staff questionnaires and 524 student questionnaires were received from the three Arizona universities. Returns were approximately 57% for faculty and staff, and 35% for students. The stringent time table within which the survey was conducted did not permit the follow-up work that would

have been required to increase the percentage return to the 70% to 80% level normally required to rule out bias and to assure validity.

	<u>UA</u>	<u>ASU</u>	<u>NAU</u>
Faculty surveys distributed:	228	187	204
Faculty surveys returned:	116	98	132
% Faculty surveys returned:	51%	52%	65%
Staff surveys distributed:	466	279	214
Staff surveys returned:	208	197	124
% Staff surveys returned:	45%	71%	58%
Student surveys distributed:	500	500	500
Student surveys returned:	155	171	198
% Student surveys returned:	31%	34%	40%

DATA

Data summary sheets were prepared for each administrative service operation for each university. Bar graphs were generated to present the numerical responses for each university in a visually meaningful way. Average (mean) ratings for the categories quality, importance, and change in quality were computed for each operation, for each university, and for each survey group. For each university, and for each survey group, the mean scores for each administrative service operation were used to rank the operations in order of quality, importance, and change in quality. Based on these rankings, graphs were developed which, for each university and survey group, show the ranked distribution of administrative operations in two ways: quality vs importance; quality vs change in quality.

Graphs were prepared that show the full range of mean ratings of quality and importance for the administrative service operations for each university by survey group; and the full range of mean ratings of quality and change in quality for the administrative service operations for each university by survey group.

Furthermore, graphs were constructed that show the individual raw scores of mean quality and importance for each administrative service operations for each university by survey group.

LIMITATIONS

The survey results reported here have value, but they also are subject to misinterpretation.

Misinterpretation could result from failure to understand inherent limitations, of the following type:

1. Although faculty, staff, and student perceptions of the quality of service provided by each administrative service operation is evaluated according to a 1.0 to 5.0 scale (very poor to very good), there are no normative data that permit us to judge what in fact is a good score for the bookstore, as opposed to custodial services; for grounds maintenance, as opposed to the office of the academic vice president; for food services, as opposed to parking or academic computing. Thus direct cross comparisons of quality ratings, one unit to another, become suspect. For example, it is probably much more difficult to win high quality marks from faculty for purchasing and parking than it is to win high marks for library services and sponsored projects. Units like

parking, security/police, and purchasing are engaged in enforcement activities, and thus are more likely to have a higher level of difficulty in generating positive, favorable perceptions.

A similar limitation characterizes student evaluations of teaching, wherein it is more difficult to win high quality marks from students enrolled in large, compulsory freshman mathematics classes than it is to win high marks in small elective graduate specialty courses. Without normative data, we cannot make the kinds of corrections in this survey of the type that for cross comparison purposes have become standard in the interpretation of student evaluations of teaching.

2. Although faculty, staff, and student perceptions of the importance of the service provided by each administrative service operation is evaluated on a 1.0 to 5.0 scale (very low to very high), there is some ambiguity regarding the basis on which importance was judged. Most respondents, we believe, evaluated importance in the manner intended: namely, the practical importance of the service provided by the unit to the user in carrying out his or her responsibilities. However some respondents evaluated importance on a different basis: namely, how important is this administrative operation and/or service to the successful functioning of a university? It makes a significant difference whether the former or latter perspective guides the rating of importance of the administrative service operations: a unit such as planning/construction or grounds maintenance may not have had

direct practical importance to a given respondent, yielding a "low importance" rating. Yet this same respondent, if asked to evaluate the importance of planning/ construction or grounds maintenance to the university overall, might rate at the level of "high importance". Similarly, a department head, dean, or vice president might rate the importance of the services provided by repair and remodeling, or risk management, much higher than these services would be rated by a faculty in the humanities. Overall we urge that no good or bad connotations should be attached to ratings of importance! The importance ratings are intended to give a sense of how essential the services are to faculty members in carrying out their teaching, research, and service; to staff carrying out their diverse supporting functions; and to students gaining an education.

3. Although faculty, staff, and student perceptions of the change in quality of the service provided by each administrative service operation is evaluated on a 1.0 to 5.0 scale (much worse to much better), we have not had time to examine the relationship between years of service at the (given) university and mean ratings. Among the faculty, some respondents are starting assistant professors, and others are senior full professors; among the students, some are starting freshmen, and others are seniors about to graduate. Various sets of respondents rated changes in quality of service on the basis of different durations of experience. Vice Presidents or directors who wish to explore for changes in

quality in a careful and sensitive manner are urged to sort the raw data in ways to assure that respondents were active on campus during the time period(s) for which perceptions of changes in quality are being sought.

4. It cannot be overemphasized that the distinctions between grand mean scores for all of the administrative service operations, viewed collectively for each of the three Arizona universities, are very small. The grand means are best estimates, but the level of confidence that the differences may be meaningful is very low, given the calculated standard deviations. For example, the grand means for staff evaluations of the quality of services of all administrative service operations at ASU, UofA, and NAU are 3.56, 3.58, and 3.60, respectively (i.e., midway between fair and good). These tiny differences are not meaningful, and if additional evaluations had been returned it is possible that the relative positions of the three universities would be changed. Consequently, with respect to the use of all grand means, it is inappropriate to rank the three universities in overall quality, overall importance, and overall change in quality of administrative service operations.
5. Although the administrative service operations for each university have been rank-ordered in categories of perceptions of quality, importance, and change in quality, the differences in ratings on which differences in rank position are based are typically very small, representing only best estimates.

The actual level of confidence that the differences between ratings of operations close to the same ranked position may be significant are typically very low, given the calculated standard deviations. The fact that a given operation, like the telephone, might reside in the upper third of the ranked listing of quality of administrative service operations may be meaningful. But the differences between a ranking of #3 vs #7 may be so slight that if additional responses had been received the rank ordering might shift by several places or more.

6. There are certain nonacademic administrative service operations that are not used at all by some faculty. Consequently, the data reported here include certain administrative service operations for which the number of ratings awarded by faculty is small. We do not know, in these cases, whether the fraction of faculty responses received bears an accurate relationship to the percent of faculty that use the service at the given university. Because of this uncertainty, and because of the small sample sizes, faculty evaluations of service provided by the following units should be viewed very cautiously: for the University of Arizona, administrative computing, core accounting, and planning/construction; for Arizona State University, administrative computing, core accounting, grounds maintenance, planning/construction, and risk management; for Northern Arizona University, administrative computing, core accounting, planning/construction, and risk management.

The same word of caution applies to the staff survey data. In this case there are certain academic operations that are not used at all by some staff. Staff evaluations of service provided by the following units, therefore, should be viewed very cautiously for the University of Arizona, the office of the academic vice president and academic computing; for Arizona State University, core accounting and risk management; for Northern Arizona University, planning/construction and sponsored projects.

7. Certain inferences cannot be derived from the survey results. For example, there can be no conclusions drawn as to the efficiency or competency of the management or staff of any of the administrative operations. In addition, it would be inappropriate to reach conclusions regarding whether or not the resources available to a given unit are adequate, inadequate, or excessive.

RESULTS

In light of these limitations, what dominant conclusions can be drawn from the survey results? There are a number. The first-order perceptions of quality, importance, and change in quality of the administrative service operations are as follows:

1. For all three universities, faculty, staff, and students perceive the quality of administrative service operations, viewed collectively, to be midway between fair and good.
2. For all three universities, faculty, staff, and students perceive the administrative service operations,

viewed collectively, as highly important to carrying out their work.

3. For all three universities, faculty, staff, and students perceive the quality of administrative service operations, viewed collectively, as staying about the same, improving slightly.
4. Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, faculty at The University of Arizona ranked the quality of 13 operations as good and 12 as fair. Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, staff at the University of Arizona ranked the quality of 15 operations as good and 10 as fair. Of the 18 administrative service operations surveyed, students at The University of Arizona ranked the quality of 11 operations as good, 6 as fair, and 1 (parking) as poor.
5. Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, faculty at Arizona State University ranked the quality of 13 administrative service operations as good, 10 as fair, and 2 (repair/remodeling and risk management) as poor. Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, staff at Arizona State University ranked the quality of 19 operations as good and 6 as fair. Of the 18 administrative service operations surveyed, students at Arizona State University ranked the quality of 11 operations as good, 6 as fair, and 1 (parking) as poor.
6. Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, faculty at Northern Arizona University ranked the quality of 4 administrative service operations as good and 21

as fair. Of the 25 administrative service operations surveyed, staff at Northern Arizona University ranked the quality of 17 administrative service operations as good and 8 as fair. Of the 18 administrative service operations surveyed, students at Northern Arizona University ranked the quality of 11 operations as good, 6 as fair, and 1 (parking) as poor.

7. Faculty and students at all three universities all agreed that only 1 of the 25 administrative service operations is of very high importance, and this was the library. No operations were considered by faculty, staff, or students to be of low or very low importance.

The graphs which portray the mean values of ratings for quality and importance of administrative service operations for each university show a reasonably dense or smooth continuous clustering of most of the values, but in all cases there are "outliers" that stand apart, and attention is drawn to these :

1. The faculty survey results for the University of Arizona reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, the library is rated higher both in quality and importance; that the garage / motor pool, grounds/maintenance, and bookstore are rated higher in quality; affirmative action is rated lower in importance; and parking, planning/construction, core accounting, repair and remodeling, and the graduate college are rated lower in quality.
2. The faculty survey results for Arizona State University reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other

units, the library is rated higher both in quality and importance; grounds/maintenance, payroll, and academic computing are rated high in quality; the garage/motorpool, repair/remodeling, and risk management are rated lower in importance; and risk management, repair/remodeling, purchasing, planning/construction, and parking are rated lower in quality.

3. The faculty survey results for Northern Arizona University reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, telephone is rated higher both in quality and importance; the library is rated higher in importance; garage/motorpool, payroll, and graduate college are rated higher in quality; risk management, stores, and affirmative action are rated lower in importance; and planning/construction, risk management, repair/remodeling, affirmative action, and parking are rated lower in quality.
4. The staff survey results for The University of Arizona reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, the library is rated higher both in quality and importance; payroll is rated higher in importance; bookstore, grounds/maintenance, printing, and payroll are rated higher in quality; grounds/maintenance and repair/remodeling are rated lower in importance; and parking is rated lower in quality.
5. The staff survey results for Arizona State University reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, the library is rated higher both in quality and importance; telephone,

security/police, payroll, and mail are rated higher in importance; bookstore, grounds/maintenance, academic vice president's office, and telephone are rated higher in quality; risk management is rated lower in importance; and that parking, planning/construction, purchasing, and custodial services are rated lower in quality.

6. The staff survey results for Northern Arizona University reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, telephone, payroll, library, and mail service are rated higher in importance; academic vice president's office, printing, garage/motorpool, and bookstore are rated higher in quality; stores, repair/remodeling, and affirmative action are rated lower in importance; and graduate college, parking, and planning/construction are rated lower in quality.
7. The student survey results for the University of Arizona reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, the library is rated higher both in quality and importance; student health, financial aid office, and parking are rated higher in importance; bookstore is rated higher in quality; cultural events is rated lower in importance; and parking and financial aid office are rated lower in quality.
8. The student survey results for Arizona State University reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, the library is rated higher both in quality and importance; the bookstore is rated higher in quality; financial aid office, student health, and registration and records are rated higher in importance; fast copy

center is rated lower in importance; and parking is rated lower in quality.

9. The student survey results for Northern Arizona University reveal that, relative to the ratings for the other units, the library is rated higher in importance; student union, bookstore, and student health are rated higher in quality; cultural events and fast copy center are rated lower in importance; and parking is rated lower in quality.

A direct, linear relation tends to exist between rankings of quality on the one hand, and rankings of change in quality on the other. The rating of "change in quality" of each administrative service operation was perhaps the most subjective of the tasks asked of those surveyed. The linear relationship observed may be simply an artifact of bias, e.g., operations perceived to be of higher quality are, without necessarily sound basis, perceived to be getting better and better; while those thought to be of lesser quality are judged to be getting better at a slower pace, or are judged to be getting worse. Certain administrative service operations do not fit the linear relationship observed, and these seem important to identify:

1. Faculty at the University of Arizona rate academic computing as about average in quality, but well above average in rate of improvement. Although the academic vice president's office is rated above average in quality, the rate of improvement is relatively low.
2. Faculty at Arizona State University rate sponsored projects as slightly below average in quality, but well

above average in rate of improvement. Although custodial services is rated as just slightly below average, its quality is perceived as getting worse.

3. Faculty at Northern Arizona University rate the office of the academic vice president, and payroll, as well above average, but the rate of improvement is relatively low. Although food services is rated as just slightly below average, its rate of improvement in quality is well above average.
4. Staff at the University of Arizona rate administrative computing as just slightly above average, but the rate of improvement is judged to be well above average. Although academic computing and the academic vice president's office are judged to be well below the average in quality, both operations are perceived to be well above average in improvement.
5. Staff at Arizona State University rate payroll and personnel as slightly above average in quality, but the rate of improvement is perceived as very low. Although food services is judged to be well below average in quality, its rate of improvement in quality is perceived to be very high.
6. Staff at Northern Arizona University rate the office of the academic vice president as very high in quality, but low in rate of improvement. Although food services is judged to be well below average in quality, its rate of improvement in quality is judged to be well above average.
7. Students at the University of Arizona rate telephone as well above average in quality, but slightly below

average in improvement. Computing is rated slightly below average in quality, but the highest of any operation in improvement. Although food services and residence halls are judged to be well below average in quality, their rate of improvement in quality is judged to be well above average.

8. Students at Arizona State University rate telephone as above average in quality, but with a change in quality that is getting worse. Payroll is judged to be average in quality, but getting worse. Computing is perceived to be slightly below average in quality, but well above average in improvement in quality. Although residence halls and food services are judged to be well below average in quality, their rate of improvement in quality is judged to be well above average.
9. Students at Northern Arizona University consider the dean of students office to be slightly below average in quality, but well below average in rate of improvement. Although food services is judged to be well below average in quality, its rate of improvement in quality is perceived to be very high.

Using mean ratings of quality, the administrative service operations for each university can be classified according to units rated higher in quality relative to other units, and units rated lower in quality relative to other units (See Appendix B).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The chief value of the results of this survey may lie in helping management to confidently identify those administrative service operations which appear to be functioning very well; to identify those that are functioning adequately; and to identify those that represent opportunities for improvement. The survey results may also permit management to evaluate whether the distribution of resources and the priorities of emphasis are in line with the importance of these administrative service operations as viewed by faculty, staff, students, and administrators. To facilitate the use of the data to bring about positive change, we have presented the survey results to the President's cabinets of each university, and are making all raw data, tables, charts, and graphs available to management at the three universities.

- o It is specifically recommended that this same survey be implemented at three year intervals in order to track changes in quality through time. These initial survey results would then provide a benchmark to help evaluate the impact of administrative decisions related to distribution of resources, organizational changes, leadership changes, and the like. Data from assessments gathered at three-year intervals could be used to map trends, such as changes in perception of quality and importance of each administrative service operation.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY-STAFF-ADMINISTRATOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

Frequently: More often than once every two months.		How often do you use this service? Frequently Sometimes Never	Rate the quality of the service provided by this unit. Very Poor Fair Very Good			Since you began using this service, how has its quality changed? Much Worse Same Much Better	Rate the importance of the service provided by this unit. Very Low Average Very High		
ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT			Poor	Fair	Good	Worse	Better	Low	High
1	ACADEMIC VP OFFICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
2	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
3	BOOKSTORE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
4	COMPUTING: ACADEMIC	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
5	COMPUTING: ADMINISTRATIVE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
6	CORE ACCOUNTING	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
7	CUSTODIAL SERVICES	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
8	FOOD SERVICES	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
9	GARAGE/MOTORPOOL	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
0	GRADUATE COLLEGE OFFICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
1	GROUNDS MAINTENANCE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
2	LIBRARY	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
3	MAIL SERVICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
4	PARKING	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
5	PAYROLL	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
6	PERSONNEL	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
7	PLANNING/ CONSTRUCTION	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
3	PRINTING/PUBS/ REPRODUCTIONS	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
3	PURCHASING	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
1	REPAIR/REMODELING SERVICES	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
	RISK MANAGEMENT	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
	SECURITY/POLICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
	SPONSORED PROJECTS	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
	STORES	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				
	TELEPHONE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]				

STUDENT ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE

Frequently: More often than once every two months.	How often do you use this service?	Rate the quality of the service provided by this unit.	Since you began using this service, how has its quality changed?	Rate the importance of the service provided by this unit.
	Frequently Sometimes Never	Very Poor Fair Good	Much Worse Same Better	Very Low Average High
ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT				
BOOKSTORE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
CULTURAL EVENTS	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
COMPUTING	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
DEAN OF STUDENTS OFFICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
FAST COPY CENTER	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
FINANCIAL AID OFFICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
FOOD SERVICES	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
GRADUATE COLLEGE OFFICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
LIBRARY	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
MAIL SERVICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
PARKING	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
PAYROLL	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
REGISTRATION/ RECORDS	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
RESIDENCE HALLS	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
SECURITY/POLICE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
STUDENT HEALTH	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
STUDENT UNION (GENERAL SERVICES)	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]
TELEPHONE	[f] [s] [n]	[vp] [p] [f] [g] [vg]	[mw] [w] [s] [b] [mb]	[vl] [l] [a] [h] [vh]